

table were Lady Hope, somewhat of an invalid, and who, as the sister of Lord Salisbury, had a title in which her husband did not share; several daughters, one of whom was to be married the following week; and a son, a student at Cambridge, who was in a state of great excitement because of a boat-race to occur that day on the Thames between the crews of Oxford and Cambridge.

Mr. Hope, a stout, near-sighted, old English gentleman, received me courteously and cordially. The breakfast was such as is usual in English families. What was singular, no servant appeared at the table, although several liveried men were quite obsequious in opening doors, taking hats, wrappings, etc. Host and daughters served the coffee, but the substantial food was on a side-table, and each person was expected to get whatever was needed or desired.

Through Mr. Hope's kindness, I secured a seat in the House of Commons, where for several hours I witnessed the proceedings and heard the debates. . . . Mr. Hope was a politician, having entered Parliament in 1841, and an author, having written a number of pamphlets and books. Possessing great wealth, he published the well-known *Saturday Review*, a periodical of much smartness, which gave a substantial aid to young and needy writers, some of whom became distinguished. Among these were Salisbury; Sir William Vernon Harcourt, the great Liberal leader; Morley, the chosen biographer of Gladstone; and Stephen, a well-known English judge and writer of law-books.

Among Mr. Hope's contributions to literature were pamphlets and books on the American War. He was an ardent friend of the South in that struggle, and was chiefly instrumental in having erected the bronze statue of Stonewall Jackson, which is in the Capitol Square of Richmond.

The following entry in the journal was made at Richmond, under date of February 6, 1880:—

Univ Calif - Digitized by Microsoft®

Went to Mozart Hall and heard Hon. Charles Parnell, M. P., and Mr. Dillon, two Irish agitators, discuss the famine in Ireland, and as the cause thereof, the land-tenure. Facts interesting, badly presented.

Of an evening spent with John Bright, he records this impression:—

In the House of Commons I once heard a short speech from John Bright, the Quaker Commoner. He had a clear, musical voice, commanded most respectful attention, and his manner of speech was earnest and forcible, and wholly free from that halting, stammering utterance, which so many English speakers and talkers affect. In 1886 during the Queen's Jubilee, I was in England, and was invited to dinner by our Minister, the Hon. E. J. Phelps. About twenty persons were present, some of great distinction, whose names and faces I should have been glad to know; but because of the stupid prevalent custom of non-introduction, I was presented to only one guest, and he was Mr. Bright, who sat between Murat Halstead and myself. He was very reticent; seemed absent-minded or absorbed in his own thoughts, and inclined me to suspect that his defection from Mr. Gladstone and alliance with the Conservatives on the Home Rule question was due, as the Liberals charged, to a loss of that vivacious, springy intellect which had previously made him such a strong debater. During the evening, inquiring whether I was an American, he said: "Your country is a very remarkable one;" and added the inquiry, "To what do you attribute its greatness?" My reply was: "That is a very difficult question. To answer it properly would require a volume; but I would mention a few causes which lie on the surface." I suggested, absence of neighbors; immense areas of fertile land; energy of free institutions; freedom of trade among the States; Home Rule, or local self-government; and absolute religious liberty. When Home Rule was instanced, he shrugged his shoulders; but evinced pleasure when I speci-

fied the inter-State free-trade, and soul liberty. On the last he made an emphatic comment of approval, and gave us credit for our superiority, in that respect, over all other nations.

It has been noted on an earlier page, that in 1890, Curry had met in Richmond, the distinguished English statesman and author, whose great work, "The American Commonwealth," is a classic exhibition of knowledge of a foreign country's institutions, achieved by an alien. Late in life, Curry wrote of Mr. Bryce as follows:—

"Apropos of the veto-power, I once related to Mr. Bryce the conversation" (heretofore detailed) "with Mr. Chamberlain; and he inquired whether such an arbitrary, one-man power did not, because of its inconsistency with our form of government, make the Executive who used it unpopular. On the contrary, I told him, it had had no such effect. Generally, except in Mr. Cleveland's vetoes of Pension Bills, the Congress and the people approved. To an inquiry as to the principal arguments in favor of the retention of such a power, I referred to the effort made by Mr. Clay and the Whig party in 1842 to modify or restrain the exercise, and its decisive defeat, brought about largely by Mr. Calhoun's unanswerable argument. 'Did you ever read that speech?' I asked. He had never heard of it. I begged him to read it, saying that when he finished, he would write after it, Q. E. D."

"In a delightful interview with Mr. Gladstone in London, in 1887, in company with Dr. Aubery, the author of the excellent 'History of the English People,' I ventured to suggest a visit to America, the enthusiastic welcome he would receive, and the general gratification of his 'Kin Beyond the Sea,' had given our people. He replied that he was too old and too busy to cross the ocean; but he had a young friend, Mr. Bryce, who had three times

crossed the ocean for the study of the people and the institutions of our great country, and his book would be worthy of the subject. 'The American Commonwealth' has more than fulfilled that prediction; and, because later and written by an Englishman, is superior to De Tocqueville."

One wishes for a more vivid picture of Gladstone from Curry, his presence, manner, speech. He greatly admired the great Englishman and wrote a sketch of him, but the critical impulse was not strong in Curry. His forte was not analysis and delineation and subtle portrayal, but exhortation and persuasion.

It has been stated in a former chapter that, in the July of 1867, Curry, then on his first European tour, heard Spurgeon preach in London; and that in the following October he heard him again and made his acquaintance. Of the first occasion when he listened to him, he made a note ten days later.

At 6 P. M.,—night, as it is called, although the sun was two hours high, I went to the tabernacle to hear Spurgeon. In the morning I had been informed that he was "out of town." In the evening I determined to ascertain for myself, and was unfortunately too late for the introductory services. Just as I entered the spacious tabernacle,—a large room with three circular galleries, which were densely packed, every available foot being occupied by sitter or stander,—I heard a clear, distinct voice reading a hymn. . . . The whole congregation, at least five thousand, joined in singing, using the familiar tune of "Ortonville." Then came a fervent prayer. Afterwards followed the sermon, about thirty-five minutes in length. There is no pulpit in the building. The preacher stood in the first gallery; and, after reading his text, leaned against the railing. His text was Luke VII, 41, 42. Without pre-

liminary remark, except a brief ejaculatory prayer for the Spirit's help, he stated the division. . . . There was nothing very striking or original in the discourse; and yet he commanded the undivided attention of the whole multitude. If the sermon I heard be a fair specimen of thought and delivery (and I think it was not), I have heard fifty preachers in the United States, who, as mere pulpit orators, are superior to him. Dr. Fuller is unapproachably ahead of him. Was I, then, disappointed? And in what consists his power?

So many accounts had been received from those who had heard him, that I was not much disappointed. The secret of his power is not a unit. It is manifold. He has a voice, wonderful not so much for its strength as for its clearness and distinctness. Directly opposite to him, and in a remote part of the building, I caught every syllable. His utterance is neither slow nor rapid. A reporter, I should judge, could easily take down his words. He is a man of earnestness, enthusiasm, prayer, faith. His preaching is practical, pointed, personal and scriptural. He loves Jesus. He talks about Jesus. He knows no other name as the foundation of a sinner's hope, than Jesus. . . . With a vein of humor in his composition, he often excites a smile;—never boisterous or irreverent laughter. The philosophy of his success is, an earnest and believing proclamation of the good news of salvation through Jesus Christ.

In the following October, after hearing Spurgeon again, and making his acquaintance, Curry wrote in a letter to the *Religious Herald*, under the caption of "A Sunday in London," a further account of the English preacher.

. . . The house was crowded. . . . Spurgeon preached. It was his first sermon for four weeks, as he had been sick. I never saw a more attentive congregation. I

have seen people more wrought upon by human speech, but every eye was fixed and every mind comprehended. The sermon was a direct, earnest, practical enforcement of Scriptural truth.

Spurgeon is now a recognized fact—an acknowledged influence—a felt power. He has been sneered at, written at, ridiculed, misrepresented, slandered; but still there is no wane in his popularity or success, nor any change of tactics, nor any cessation of aggressive effort. . . . Strictly and rhetorically speaking, Spurgeon is not an orator. A score of men could be mentioned who are his superiors as a mere speaker. His strength is not in his oratorical abilities. Of course he is not deficient in these respects. His person is not commanding. His voice is not particularly mellifluous. His gesticulation is ordinary, and he is not, in my judgment, pre-eminent for logic or eloquence. How then has Charles Haddon Spurgeon, at the age of 33, become in the estimation of so many, the prince of living preachers?

His voice is clear and his articulation almost perfect. His language is strong, vigorous Saxon; his style easy and flowing, and at the same time terse and condensed. His method is natural, perspicuous, orderly; and the most uncultivated can remember his divisions. He has a marvellous fecundity and appositeness of illustration, and his figures and images, like the caryatides in architecture, give both strength and ornament to his discourse. . . . He has entire command of his resources, his voice and emotions; and his speaking never descends to mere declamation. But his power lies back of all these auxiliaries. He is a man of earnestness, sincerity, piety, prayer, faith, and full of the Holy Spirit. He is a consecrated man. His heart is in the ministry. His soul is afire with the love of God, and zeal for perishing sinners. He preaches, more than any one I ever heard, right at each individual hearer, and he preaches Jesus Christ and Him alone as the Saviour of sinners.

In April of 1876 he wrote in his journal about Spurgeon:—

I now purpose an account of a Sunday in London, with some thoughts suggested by the worship and the preachers.

Of course, Spurgeon was my first choice. I have an invariable rule to hear J. A. B. (John A. Broadus) once on a Sabbath if I am where he preaches; and a similar rule might be adopted, with like results, if one is where Spurgeon preaches.

Curry's reminiscences of the great English religious exhorter may be concluded with an extract from one of his contributions in March, 1892, to the *Religious Herald*:—

The numerous announcements of publications relating to Spurgeon and his extraordinary career, and the eager haste with which compilers and publishers are seeking to get before the public, are the proof of the anxiety with which everything authentic pertaining to the great preacher is read. Some one, in giving an account of a memorial meeting, ascribed to me an intimacy with him, which I had not the honor to possess. It was my privilege to hear him preach a number of times from 1867 onwards; to get an occasional letter from him; and to enjoy a brief companionship at his home and under his roof. It so happens that a letter, written to one of my children in 1875, lies before me, and in it an account is given of a Sunday in London, when I heard Liddon, Parker and Spurgeon.

This paragraph is followed by an account, substantially similar to that given above, of his estimate of Spurgeon's methods and abilities; and of a visit to the preacher's home. It is clear that the great

preacher interested him and stirred his critical faculties more than the statesmen and lawgivers.

Turning now to others with whom Curry was more intimately acquainted, we find in his *memorabilia*, further reminiscences than those already given, of Joseph LeConte, Benjamin Hill, Linton and Alexander H. Stephens, William L. Yancey, Sergeant S. Prentiss, Howell Cobb, Robert Toombs and Judah P. Benjamin.

First, of LeConte, who in his "Autobiography" tells of the college career of himself and his brother, Lewis, but seems to make no mention by name of any other of his classmates or college mates:—

As LeConte became the most distinguished of all my fellow collegians, as an author and a scientist, it may be of interest to state that he and his brother, natives of Liberty County (Georgia) which gave more students to the College than any other County except Clarke, were classmates and room-mates. Both were noted for their unblemished purity of morals, courtesy of demeanor, studious habits and general popularity. Lewis had much native talent in drawing and sculpture. "Joe," as he was called, played on the flute exquisitely; and while his class-standing was fair, he gave no special promise of the distinction in science he subsequently attained,—no prophecy of the exalted place he won and merited in the scientific and literary world. These adjectives do not convey a proper idea of his many-sidedness; for geology, biology, optics, philosophy, theology and education enjoyed his attention. His orthodox views on Evolution and the Bible gave comfort to many pious people who feared that modern science was undermining their faith. He demonstrated the consistency of science and religion, and retained unwaveringly his connection with the Presbyterian Church and his profession of personal faith in Christ.

Of Benjamin H. Hill, the great Georgian, Curry says:—

Ben Hill was a fellow-student of the class of 1844, and he was brilliant and popular, and gave promise of that remarkable ability which made him a conspicuous debater in the council-halls of the country, and his early death an irreparable calamity to his beloved South.

As has been heretofore recorded, he first met Alexander H. Stephens during his college days at Athens.

“It has been my good fortune,” he wrote in an article in the *Atlanta Constitution* in 1899, “to have seen and heard many distinguished Georgians, and with not a few I have enjoyed relations of intimacy or friendship. A long catalogue comes to my memory, embracing Bartow, Law, Lawton, the Jacksons, the Crawfords, the Cobbs, Nesbit, Murray, Jenkins, the Stephenses, Dougherty, Hillyer, Well, Tucker, Pierce, Haygood, Iverson, the Colquitts, Hall, Hill, Barnett, Grady, Berrien, Johnson, Brown and others. . . .

When a small boy in my native country of Lincoln, I was present at a session of the Superior Court over which William H. Crawford presided, and at which were present such attorneys as Joseph Henry Lumpkin, Francis Cone, Robert Toombs and Andrew J. Miller. . . . At subsequent courts Alexander H. Stephens attended. The physical man was in marked contrast to the intellectual; for there was scarcely flesh enough on his bones to cover his brilliant genius. Tall, cadaverous, apparently bloodless, weighing about a hundred pounds, he was capable at the bar, on the stump, in legislative halls, of as much work as the most athletic and robust. In the years 1839-1843, I saw him several times in Athens. . . . Going one day into Linton's room in the “old college” building, I was introduced to “Brother Aleck,” who was lying on the bed,

and most unprepossessing, except as his eyes shone with unusual lustre. . . . From that day until his death, while he was in Federal and Confederate Congresses, Vice-president of the Confederacy and Governor of Georgia, I saw him often, and because of association and friendship with Linton, he treated me with much consideration and kindness.

He was a ready and able debater, quick at repartee, careful in preparation of his speeches, clear and logical in the presentation of his arguments, and at times impassioned and eloquent. His articulation was distinct; and frequently his voice assumed an upward and downward intonation, a semi-musical swell and fall, acquired probably from much speaking in the open air. In the House of Representatives at Washington, where few were listened to, he always commanded undivided attention; and once, during his speech on the admission of Oregon as a State into the Union, the applause, begun on the floor, was taken up by the galleries and continued, until it amounted to an ovation.

. . . . The mind of Mr. Stephens was fruitful of suggestions; his opinions, matured by experience and profound study, were conservative; his heart was hopeful. . . . Social in his nature, loving human companionship, fond of talking, he was a coveted guest at many homes.

He adds of Stephens, in his journal:—

On 20th April, 1874, Mr. Stephens was in Richmond, and was very feeble,—little more than a walking skeleton. His intellect was undimmed; his eye sparkled like a big diamond; and his conversation was interesting and instructive. Once when I called, I found Governors Wise and Kemper with him; and he gave a graphic account of the visit of the Confederate Commissioners to Gen. Grant; of the General's honesty, patriotism and ability, he expressed himself in warm and eulogistic terms.

S. S. Prentiss, William L. Yancey and Wendell Phillips profoundly captivated and impressed him. Of Prentiss he wrote in 1877:—

Prior to the Whig nomination (in 1844), I heard S. S. Prentiss of Mississippi, one of the most eloquent men in America, make a speech to a packed audience in Faneuil Hall. It was one of the most thrilling specimens of platform oratory I ever listened to, and he carried his audience at pleasure.

Writing in 1890, in the *Religious Herald*, some "Reminiscences of the Early Days of the Anti-Slavery Movement," he says of Wendell Phillips, the great abolitionist agitator:—

To have heard Phillips forty-five years ago was a partial education for a young student. He, S. S. Prentiss, and W. L. Yancey, were the great orators of this country.

His admiration of the stirring eloquence and extraordinary oratorical gifts of Prentiss and of Yancey never waned; and in his latter years he confirmed his earlier judgment of them in this statement:—

I have been very often asked who was the greatest orator I ever heard. . . . Speaking is so various, that it can not be classified. Some is compact, some diffusive; some sober, some humorous; some logical, some rhetorical; some argumentative, some didactic; some dry, some very entertaining. Oratory and eloquence are by no means identical. My definition of oratory would be, "Let us go and fight Philip." This requires a great occasion, a crisis, the suspension of human interests on a single hour, on an overshadowing, imperative issue. Demosthenes, Mirabeau and Henry were orators. It has been my privilege to hear Canovas, Sagasta, Moret and Castelar in Spain; Gambetta in France; Balfour, Fawcett, D'Israeli, Bright

and Gladstone in England; Choate, Webster, Phillips, Douglas, Benjamin, Bowden, Corwin, Seward, McDuffie and others in the United States. They differed widely. Each had his excellencies; but as orators taking captive unwilling audiences, holding in possession emotions, convictions, will, person and property,—driving to conclusions which surrendered everything to the speaker,—those who in my judgment were the greatest were S. S. Prentiss and William L. Yancey,—one a native of Maine, the other of South Carolina.

Curry never failed to express his admiration of Yancey; and he records his having, when an elector on the Buchanan ticket, dined with the great orator at the meeting of the electoral college at Montgomery. Another note of his about Yancey is that the latter said to him, by way of advice, when he was a law-student: “Young man, if you wish to succeed at the bar, learn to think on your legs,”—a more valuable, if more difficult lesson to learn than that of the famous orator and wit; Tom Corwin, of Ohio, who advised a young disciple of Blackstone, inquiring the road to success: “Be solemn, young man! Be solemn as an ass!”

Among the distinguished Georgians who were Curry’s friends, he often spoke and wrote of Robert Toombs and Howell Cobb. Associating Toombs and Alexander H. Stephens, he said:—

Perhaps no two public men occupying distinguished positions in our country ever sustained a longer and closer intimacy than Stephens and Robert Toombs. Born in adjoining counties, educated at the same college, practising law in the same courts, they were as Damon and Pythias. . . . Physically they were antipodes; Stephens, delicate, with yellow complexion, frail body, his survival

amid severe labors, physical weaknesses, a sword-thrust and the fall of a gate upon him, seemed a miracle; Toombs, robust, vigorous, boisterous, aggressive, a Boanerges, was the impersonation of health.

I saw Toombs for the first time in attendance upon the Superior Court of Lincoln County. . . . He was then about twenty-five years of age, and was a model of manly beauty. From that time until his death I saw him frequently, and never received anything at his hands except generous hospitality, marked courtesy and flattering regard. . . . By a sort of logical and political fitness of things, he became the first Secretary of State of the Confederacy. President Davis and he were not built on the same pattern, and friction was inevitable. Restive as a subordinate of the President, and impatient for service in another field, he entered the army, where for reasons not desirable to be stated, he did not add to his reputation nor achieve any military renown. With gifts rarely surpassed, he reached the art of seizing the genius and tendency of a critical epoch. His ability was perhaps more destructive than constructive. During the French Revolution some men were called "architects of ruin." I recall a dramatic incident in a secret session of the Provisional Congress, held in the Hall of the House of Deputies in the Capitol at Richmond, when the success of the Confederacy was under consideration, and foreign succor, financial schemes, and other expedients were under discussion. After a warm debate, General Toombs took the floor, and in less than an hour delivered one of the most powerful speeches I ever listened to, on our available means of safety. Every deputy sat with concentrated and rapt attention, amazed at the extraordinary ability of the man, and surprised and delighted at the seemingly wise and adequate scheme which was presented for our triumph. When he closed, there was silence, almost painful, for a considerable time in the body, when Mr. Robert H. Smith of Mobile arose and said: "Mr. President, if the gentleman from Georgia does not

bring in bills to carry out what he has suggested, he is a worse traitor than Benedict Arnold." The idea of Mr. Smith was that no one comprehended the situation as did General Toombs, and on no other person did the obligation rest as heavily for devising and framing the adequate legislation.

In 1859-1860, while a representative in the United States Congress, Curry dined frequently at the home of General Cobb, in Washington, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, and whose wife, a Lamar, was a relative of Curry's. The latter knew Cobb at the University of Georgia, having first met him there when he came to deliver political speeches before the local club.

"Howell Cobb," he says, "was a remarkable man,—not so scholarly as his younger brother, T. R. R., nor so studious or diligent as Stephens or Toombs, but with quicker intellect and readier faculty of adaptation, because of resources on unexpected occasions, and of what some writers call the genius of common sense. Inclined to corpulency, good-humored, amiable, cordial in manner and disposition, with a genial nature giving sway over equals, practical rather than theoretical, he was a devoted husband, and affectionate father, a generous friend, and emphatically a people's man."

Not the least in Curry's opinion, of this group of Southern statesmen, was Judah P. Benjamin. In a series of "Recollections of Great Southerners," published in the *Atlanta Constitution* a few years before his death, and from which the foregoing extracts about Toombs and Howell Cobb are taken, Curry says of Benjamin:—

His parents were English Jews, who on their way to America landed in one of the West Indies, where Judah

was born. His early boyhood was spent in North Carolina; but removing to New Orleans he was called to the bar in 1832, and won high respect as a lawyer and advocate. In 1857 I made his acquaintance, when he was a Senator with Slidell, of *Trent* memory, as his colleague. He was a low, stout, genial, smiling man, of decided Jewish cast, with bright, black eyes, and all the grace and suavity of a polished Frenchman, looking as if he never had a trouble. To me he was one of the most attractive and fascinating men I ever met in public life. While Senator, he not infrequently appeared before the Supreme Court; and when he was to argue a case, there was as much anxiety to hear him as there is now to hear Joseph Choate or James C. Carter. In the Senate, where were such men as Douglas, Green, Sumner, Pugh, he had no superior as a debater. One of his best known speeches, which during its delivery filled the galleries, and nearly emptied the House of Representatives, was in reply to Seward, and in vindication of Judge Taney and the Dred Scott decision. The exposure of the sophistry and misrepresentation of the New York Senator was something terrible; and yet after the numerous and cordial congratulations were over, the New Yorker, who had listened with stolid composure to the merciless castigation and exposure, approached Benjamin and shook hands with him. Years afterwards I asked Benjamin what Seward had the cheek to say, so calmly, after the argument; and was told that after some pleasant compliment about the ability of the speech, Seward took mild exception to some statement as to his position. Another great speech, a powerful defence of State-rights, heard with admiration by Sir G. C. Lewis of England, was made in the Senate on the 31st of December, 1860. Benjamin was collected and self-possessed in debate, had a voice as musical as the chimes of silver bells, a memory like Macaulay's, used no notes, and while earnest in manner and delivery, seemed as fresh at the close of a discourse as when he uttered the first sentence. His versatility and his

capacity for work were immense, and he turned from one subject or duty to another with such facility and cleverness that he seemed to have no special aptitudes or preferences.

Benjamin's interesting career is known to the English-speaking world. A citizen, successively, of three governments, he was renowned under all. "The little Jew has stated his opponent out of court," whispered one of the Justices of the Supreme Court to another, on the occasion of Benjamin's opening statement in his first case before that august tribunal; and if, as Curry says, "he seemed to have no special aptitude," it can hardly be doubted that one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of his intellectual gifts,—illustrated alike in his speeches and his writings,—was this unique power of exact and lucid statement.

Among the noted or famous preachers of America, Curry himself a preacher and not the least known, had naturally a wide and intimate circle of friends. In addition to those already mentioned in these pages, it may not be invidious to name here Basil Manly, Philip Schaff, J. P. Boyce, J. B. Jeter, John A. Broadus, Moses D. Hoge, J. L. Burrows, W. S. Plumer and Richard Fuller. At the inauguration of Jefferson Davis, February 18, 1861, he was present, and heard Manly's prayer. His address before the World's Evangelical Alliance at New York, in 1873, was made at the request of Schaff, among others. Of Plumer and Jeter he has left the record of some pleasing reminiscences:—

On 10 November, 1868, travelling on a train between Selma and Talladega, Dr. W. S. Plumer was my companion. In course of conversation, he pronounced Andrew

Fuller's "Gospel its Own Witness" to be the best defence of Christianity in the English language. He further said that the celebrated astronomical argument of Dr. Chalmers was more forcibly stated by Dr. Gill.

In his "Recollections of a Long Life," Dr. Jeter says the formation of an African church in Richmond, which he had in contemplation in 1842, did not receive the countenance of some Protestant pastors in the city. To a suggestion for a meeting of the clergy, to get their advice, Dr. Plumer, then pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, said: "Don't do it. The clergy may decide against your plan: but it is right; go forward in the work; and if you have trouble, I will stand by you." When an effort was being made to secure an indictment against those who had the meetings of the church in charge, the Doctor visited Dr. Jeter, and said: "I wish you to understand that in any difficulties you may have concerning the African church I am to go halves with you." It should be remembered that this noble and courageous offer was made sixty years ago.

Of Richard Fuller, he wrote in the *Religious Herald*:—

Richard Fuller would have been called an ugly man. He was gigantic in stature, with shaggy hair, coarse features, but was imperial, imposing, graceful in movement, with varying moods, the irresistible rush of a tornado, the soft sighing of a gentle zephyr—once seen in his majestic power, never forgotten. He was a rare man, a combination of contradictory qualities, and in pagan days would have been worshipped as a Hercules, or the god of eloquence. Grace subdued him, mastered him, consecrated his powers, made him a little child, submissive, affectionate, obedient at his Master's feet. Sometimes, when aroused and indignant, he thundered with the majesty and wrath of Zeus his anathemas against falsehood and hypocrisy, against cowardice and crime; and at another time he had a child on his shoulders, romping through the house or

in the yard with the frolicsomeness of a kitten. He had a keen sense of the ludicrous, was an inimitable *raconteur*, and often charmed or convulsed an audience or circle of friends by his flashes of wit, recital of amusing incidents, or ludicrous presentations of personal characteristics.

Graduating from Harvard, he entered upon the practice of the law in Beaufort, S. C., and sprang at once to the front, with most alluring prospects of wealth, position, and fame. Dr. Daniel Baker, a Presbyterian evangelist, held a series of meetings, and Elliott (afterwards Bishop in Georgia), Fuller and others were "converted." Fuller soon entered the ministry and began his illustrious career as, perhaps, the foremost man in the American pulpit,—certainly ranking alongside of Beecher, Brooks and Broadus. He had two controversies, one with that learned prelate, Bishop England, on the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, and the other with Dr. Wayland, of Brown University, on African slavery as it existed in the Southern States. The latter discussion, marked by great ability on both sides, was characterized as well by the lowliest spirit, and not a word was written by either which was in the slightest degree offensive or needful of apology or explanation. These men remained closest friends until death for a time separated them, and Dr. Wayland, famed for philosophy and learning, once remarked that he would cheerfully surrender whatever learning and philosophy he had acquired to be able to preach as Richard Fuller did.

"In estimating preachers," says Curry, in a newspaper article, "we must apply a different standard. Every preacher, nearly, occupies a pulpit, lifted above the people, and separated by 'a great gulf.' Humor, so effective, is eliminated, tabooed, and only such bold men as Beecher and Spurgeon broke down the barrier. Responses and inquiries from hearers, so suggestive, awakening, are not allowed. Generally the preacher is handicapped by a manuscript.

"Whom have I heard? Their names are legion. Bersyer, Pressensé, Père Hyacinthe, in France; Cuming, Parker, Maclaren, Hall, Stanley, Farrar, Liddon, Spurgeon, in England; Stow, Park, Parker, Lorimer, Hall, Greer, MacArthur, Dixon, Brooks, Beecher, Hoyt, Jones, Burrows, Duncan, Poindexter, Hawthorne, Hoge, Palmer, Galloway, Pierce, Behrends, Stafford—well, my paper would scarcely hold the names of all. For a single sermon, Dr. T. G. Jones preached the most powerful one I ever heard, and George Pierce the most eloquent one. For cyclopean energy, compulsive appeal, absorbedness in Christ, dramatic force (on the stage he would have equalled Macready or Booth or Irving), Richard Fuller had no superior; for tender persuasiveness, Manly, Sr., had few equals; for massive intellect and exaltation of the man in man, Brooks was Saul among the Prophets. To select one and place him on the loftiest pedestal is impossible. For continuity and greatness of success, for number and wide circulation of sermons, for marvellous capacity in reaching every one in his audience, and making him feel that the sermon was especially intended for him . . . Spurgeon can have no rival.

"In some respects, in many respects, John A. Broadus was without a superior. Some preachers may, in occasional efforts, have excelled him; yet as a stated supply, to sit a whole year under one man's ministry, he would have unhesitatingly been chosen. At conventions, when others preached at the same hour, I always heard him, and never regretted it. I do not remember ever to have seen him with a manuscript, and yet he prepared carefully and minutely, not trusting to a full mind on the excitement of the occasion. He was never boisterous, never declamatory, never tore a passion into tatters. His articulation was distinct, his voice was 'clear, pervasive, pathetic, and he possessed such simplicity, charm, sincerity, magnetism, power, that he controlled the entire audience. An inexplicable quality he possessed beyond any one I ever heard,

—in the same sermon he secured and held the attention of, and entertained and instructed alike, the old and the young, the cultured and the ignorant. In Dr. Jones's admirable book on 'Religion in the Army,' he tells us of the delight and the success with which Broadus preached in camps. Lee and Jackson and Gordon and Hill and Ewell and Early, officers and privates by the thousands, in sunshine, in rain, in cold, in darkness, sat or stood and listened, entranced, subdued, by the pleadings of the holy man of God."

Among the distinguished men of the Federal Congress and Cabinet, of earlier and later times, with whom Curry was on more or less intimate or friendly terms, he makes mention of Henry Winter Davis, John Sherman, Elihu Washburne, Thomas S. Bock, William M. Evarts and Thomas F. Bayard. Of the Presidents he counted among his friends Messrs. Buchanan, Grant, Hayes, Cleveland and Roosevelt. This reminiscence of Mr. Buchanan at the White House is a striking illustration of the increased cost of living, now ruling in our social standards:—

While dining, no one was present except the President, Miss Harriet Lane and myself. He said that, being without a family, he in his public career determined to be satisfied if his estate reached one hundred thousand dollars. It amounted to that sum before he became President; and so he concluded to spend liberally his salary, which then was twenty-five thousand dollars per annum. "You know," said he, "that I entertain as much as any of my predecessors, and yet I have not exhausted what is allotted to me."

His associations with many of the generals of the Confederacy during the progress of the War between

the States, and in the years following its close, have been heretofore mentioned or detailed in these pages. Among these, there was none whom he more admired than General Joseph E. Johnston.

"Gen. Johnston," he writes in his diary, under date of August 28, 1877, "told me that he and Gen. Lee were classmates at West Point, and quite intimate; his father having been an adjutant to Gen. Lee's father in the Revolution, the friendship was hereditary,
 . . . "Generals Jubal Early and Joe Hooker were at the Military Academy at the same time. In the debating society an altercation occurred between them, and Early walked across the room and kicked Hooker. Hooker did not resent, and Southern students 'cut' him as a coward. In the Florida War Hooker was so coolly brave as to win admiration and friendship. In the Mexican War he won the appellation of 'Fighting Joe'; and in our Civil War he retained the distinction."

On September 8 of the same year, while at the White Sulphur Springs, Curry wrote in his diary:—

In a conversation with General J. E. Johnston, he said that just after his surrender to General Sherman, when they were alone, General Sherman showed him a telegram announcing the assassination of Lincoln, remarking that he had withheld it from his officers, lest they might, contrary to his own opinion, hold Confederates responsible for the crime, and be exasperated against them. He was debating in his mind how to communicate the intelligence, and prevent the inference. In Sherman's book, it appears that the information was given in general order that night, the complicity of Confederates asserted.

Sherman's account of his (J.'s) behavior at the surrender is purely fictitious.

On March 24, 1891, Curry was an honorary pall-bearer at General Johnston's funeral. Under that date the *Washington Post* published an interview with him about Johnston, of which the following is an extract:—

He was a very reticent man, and talked but little about the affairs of his army on any occasion. He was the most enthusiastic and scientific soldier I ever knew. Often at night, when we were riding along on that memorable retreat, he would talk to me for hours about the famous campaigns of Wellington or Marlborough, for whom he seemed to have an especial admiration; and, of course, of the great campaigns of Napoleon. He was as familiar with all those great military campaigns as I with my a b c's. He was a thorough and indefatigable student of military affairs. He was a close reader of Napier's works, and of the dispatches of Napoleon and Wellington, devouring them as a student would a work on mathematics before an examination. Military works and problems were meat and drink to him. Though, while I was attached to his staff, we were constantly falling back before Gen. Sherman's army, Gen. Johnston was never surprised. He seemed always to know what the enemy was going to do before it was done. He made his cavalry, as he said cavalry should be, the eyes and ears of an army. In consequence his officers were able to report to him constantly the enemy's movements. I once saw the General in a towering rage, and only once. . . . Gen. Sherman always had the highest regard for Johnston's military ability. He could never hazard anything with Johnston. Johnston was firm, abrupt in his manner of speaking, and thoroughly self-reliant; yet he was kind-hearted, a true friend, and very sympathetic.

Col. Harvie, of Johnston's staff, says the General was the first military man this country has produced. Lee was the greatest man, Johnston was the greatest soldier.

Between the covers of the little diaries, and scattered through the numerous notes and newspaper clippings which Curry preserved, may be found many other stories, incidents and reminiscences concerning acquaintances and friends of his, whose names are destined to illustrate the pages of contemporary history.

CHAPTER XXI

EDUCATIONAL THEORIES

IF Curry may not be reckoned a great educational theorist in the broadest and most original sense, his writings and speeches on education quite clearly show that in the course of his experience he had worked out and developed a coherent and consistent scheme, which proved, in its application to the peculiar conditions of the time, to be of excellent practical value. This scheme, clearly formulated about certain fundamental propositions, is illustrated not only in the essays on educational theory that are contained in the pages of his Reports to the Peabody Board, but appears perhaps most luminous in the various speeches and addresses made by him to legislative bodies, upon whom he was seeking to impress his theories to the end of obtaining their practical application. Yet no one of these addresses contains the whole of his educational ideal, which is obtainable only by segregating and co-ordinating the cardinal principles upon which the entire scheme rests.

A primary proposition of his general theory is that education and ethics are inseparable, and that the development of the ethics which should accompany education ought not to stop short of Christianity itself. He was a protagonist for school and church as nearly one as they might be made; and it was his

custom, in theory and practice, to walk from the doorway of one into the doorway of the other.

"What of the night?" he said at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1883. "I can only answer: Do what lies nearest in the light of duty and conscience and the Scriptures, and leave results to God. If any safe solution there is, it must be in the school-house and church house, in education and in the gospel of Jesus Christ, bearing in mind the object of education is not so much the imparting of knowledge as the developing of powers and the building up of inward strength of character. Education is no Catholicon, any more than freedom is; it does not cure social and political ills. It must be supplemented by and allied to the uplifting, renovating, regenerating power of the Christian religion."

In his contemplation of the significance of education, the development of the most highly cultivated intellect, untouched and undirected by such a code of ethical conduct as is indicated in the Sermon on the Mount, might for him never be "a panacea for human ills." "Head, hand and heart should be in partnership," he declared, with insistent emphasis.

A second fundamental of Curry's educational scheme was that public education is a perpetual public duty. If, as he said at Louisville, education "does not cure social and political ills," yet without it the social statics that Herbert Spencer defines as being "the conditions essential to human happiness" may not continue to exist; and in his ultimate judgment the duty which man owes the State in the matter of education falls far short of what the State owes man. "It is the right of the unborn to be granted an intelligent and refined parentage."

It is the prime business and duty of each generation to educate the next. No legislation in the United States is

more important than that which pertains to the universal education of our citizens. . . . The basis of free institutions is the intelligence and integrity of the citizen. . . . In a popular government an educated people is the best constitution. . . . Universal education, even approximately, is impossible except through governmental direction and public revenues. . . . Primarily it is the duty of local communities and of States, by local and general taxation, to furnish education for all youth. The education of the children of a State is properly a burden on property and is the cheapest defence of the property and the lives of citizens.

“The duty of parents and churches must not be ignored and underestimated,” he told the Georgia legislature in December, 1888; “but the whole history of the human race shows their insufficiency. . . . Without State system and support, general education is impossible. Parental and individual and church efforts have never approximated the needs of the young. The common claim of the exclusive right of parents to train their children is based on a false assumption of sole ownership. Children belong to community and State as well as to father and mother. Society is intensely interested in the well-being, the proper instruction of youth.”

He preached this doctrine of the State's duty to childhood in every Commonwealth that the Peabody Fund included in its scope, and with such effect as to fasten the modern public education theory upon the minds of legislators as a commonplace of thought. It was his supreme message and he drove it home with unwearied energy and infinite variety.

The patriotism, intelligence and virtue of the individual citizen is the foundation upon which rests free representative government. The education and proper training of the voters who must choose the public officers to carry on

the State's affairs is therefore a sacred duty, which cannot be neglected without injury to the State and to society. Ignorance is no remedy for anything.

This was the message that he bore to the law-makers of South Carolina in 1890; and in the same year he insisted to the legislature of Louisiana that "Universal education is an imperative duty."

While thus proclaiming the duty of government to provide instruction for the whole body of its citizenship, he did not fail to maintain that this provision should be under the sole control of the State or of some local or municipal authority. He never lost sight for a moment, in his most ardent advocacy of universal education, of that profound basis of political and economic philosophy, upon which the whole superstructure of his thought and conduct was reared. He carried the apparently complex, and yet ever simple, doctrine of constitutional "strict interpretation" not only into his life as a statesman, but as undividedly into his life as an educator.

"In our system of co-equal and correlated States, a national system of education is undesirable, as is a national University," he declared in 1883; "and the subordination of State school systems to Federal direction and control is contrary to the genius of our institutions. The separate States are not to be absorbed, nor sunk into provincial dependencies. We seek the harmonious blending of the centrifugal and centripetal, liberty and union, local self-government and a Federal government, all preserved in strength and orderly unity.

"National aid to State schools will secure the benefits of a national education."

It was upon this philosophic survey of the educational forces, blending into the harmony that springs

from the inviolate "genius of our institutions," that he established his support, with constant pen and ready tongue, of the Blair Bill.

He desired the Federal aid for a cause which he saw sorely needed pecuniary help; but he did not anticipate, as other State Rights leaders of the period anticipated and feared, that the grant of Federal aid would prove the prelude to the compulsion of Federal control.

With all his eagerness to obtain the enlarged facilities which he expected from the Blair Bill, he valued beyond any Federal aid to education in the South the financial assistance which State after State, under his influence and that of his coadjutors, learned at last to give out of its own strength and of its poverty, and with a generosity hardly equalled in the history of public education throughout the world. Writing to Mr. Winthrop, under date of September 27, 1894, about the Peabody Normal College at Nashville, he says:—

Useful as is the College, marvelous as has been its success under its very able President, it is not a substitute for our State Normals, and can never do the work of those indispensable local institutions.

The vision of a complete State school system was clear to his mind.

The material value of education was another factor in Curry's general plan, which he properly considered might be appropriately emphasized to a people just emerging from the poverty wrought by war and reconstruction. That education was an asset of estimable value in the life of the individual, the State and the Republic did not, however, obscure

his recognition of the fact that the utilitarian advantage to be derived from it was only one of many advantages.

"Industrial success, productive industry, accumulation of capital, remunerative wages, national independence, national well-being, cannot be separated from general education," he said in his Louisville address, above mentioned; and, in 1885, in a speech before the legislature of Alabama, he re-asserted the proposition in another form:—

Education is the fundamental basis of general and permanent prosperity. Poverty is the inevitable result of ignorance. Capital follows the school-house.

In an address delivered in 1888 to the legislature of Georgia, he made application of the economic principle as one equally conducive to the development of good citizenship, and of patriotism itself.

The lowest considerations of self-interest demand the competent support of universal education. Free government is the outcome of diffused intelligence and broad patriotism. An ignorant rabble is food for riots and the tool of demagogues.

This proposition, which he dwelt upon wherever and whenever he spoke to the law-making bodies that controlled the purse-strings of the public revenues, was nowhere put by him more forcibly or with finer effect than in a speech to the legislature of Alabama, on December 2, 1896.

"Looked at economically," he said on that occasion, "it is not difficult to demonstrate the money value of education to individuals and society; and in the very lowest utilitarian view which you can take, education is convertible into lands and houses and taxable property. Intelligence

is a great money-maker, and it does not make it either by extortion or fraud or corruption. It is a money-maker, because it creates products cheaper and better than ignorance ever did or ever can. Brute force spends itself always unproductively. The highest principles of political economy and of social well-being demand the universal education of children and the prevention of non-producers among men. . . . The true mint of wealth is not at Philadelphia nor San Francisco, but is in the school-house."

As a subsidiary part of his larger plan, his general scheme included the value of manual training to the developing child; and, in elucidating this branch of his theory, he drew a significant and notable distinction between this "manual training" and the peculiar "industrial training" which has come to be used with distinguished effect and marked advantage in the education at Hampton and Tuskegee of Indians and negroes.

"Industrial training," said Curry in a speech before the Virginia legislature in the winter of 1891-1892, "is to give special training in the mechanic arts, to teach shoe-making, carpentering, blacksmithing, as a trade. Manual training, as the term is limited, is to give a general training, a dexterity, to the hands, so that they may readily acquire skill in any of the mechanic arts. This is an effectual educational process, bringing hand, eye and brain to work together, developing harmoniously all the powers of a human being."

"The most interesting and profitable changes that have been made in the ends of modern education," he told the legislature of Georgia, a year or more later, "is the incorporation of manual training in the curriculum, so as to bring education into contact with the pursuits of every day."

As may be inferred from the perusal of earlier pages of this book, the normal school stands out boldly in Curry's panorama of public education. If any one man may be so singled out and honored, Curry, by his intense devotion to the idea of scientific teacher-training, his personal interest in the newly born State normal schools, and his faith in their future, deserves the title of the "father of the Normal Schools in the South." It is difficult to imagine the growth of such powerful foundations as the normal colleges at Farmville, Greensboro, Rock Hill, Natchitoches, without his fostering care and quickening influence. And his conception of the College at Nashville as a great central station of teaching efficiency and power was an act of pure educational inspiration ranking with the visions that have given immortality to the great educational reformers.

The imperative and ever unsatisfied need of trained teachers is indicated in the organization and conduct of all successful public school systems; and the need of the product illustrates the necessity of what shall create that product. Public schools, without normal schools and colleges to supply them with trained teachers, would be as antiquated in the modern view of education, as ocean liners without steam.

"Teaching is a science, with methods and principles and laws," he said at Blacksburg, Virginia, in 1882. "To direct intellectual action, we must understand intellectual action,—the true nature and functions and capabilities and order of development of the mind we are seeking to educate or instruct. Teaching is based on psychology. Pedagogy is psychology applied to teaching. . . . As a

necessary part of our public school system, we need normal schools for training teachers,—not annexes, attachments, but separate and distinct schools.

“As essential to a public school system, and to the claim of the State to educate, are normal schools to fit teachers for their work.”

Other sayings of his, on public occasions, and especially in the uncertain field of legislation, where his most important work was often done, illustrate his views of training teachers, and of the need of good teachers in the schools. He said in a circular, addressed to State Superintendents of Education throughout the territory lying within the jurisdiction of his duties as Peabody Agent:—

While practical results are aimed at, it would be unfortunate should the instruction degenerate into a series of drills. Intelligence is the basis of all skill; and appreciation of the psychological reasons for the preference given to any particular method is regarded as essential to good teachers.

So significant did he deem the education of the teacher who was to educate the child, that he was insistent upon having rigid investigation into the qualifications of the teacher, before he should be allowed to come into didactic contact with the mind of the child.

“License to teach,” he said to the Virginia legislature in February, 1892, “should be given only to those who have passed satisfactory examinations in the branches to be taught, in the principles, and in the best methods of teaching;” and he added with a profound insight that epitomized in its expression the whole philosophy of school-education: “The teacher is the school.”

It was a saying worthy of Arnold of Rugby, or of any of the great pedagogues, who have illustrated in their own lives and careers, as instructors of youth, its essential verity.

Perhaps of all the marks which,—as the hatchet-cuts in trees, through a theretofore untraversed forest, point the course of the pioneer,—blazon the pathway of this adventurer through a region where, to many, his propaganda was scarcely less startling than had been the results of war itself, none seemed more daring, or to this day remains so stoutly doubted by many, as his long cherished theory of the co-education of the sexes. The proposition, when first broached in its less aggressive form of an equal opportunity of education to women, failed to commend itself to the favorable consideration of a society which hardly believed that women needed such education as is fit for men,—the education that enables its possessor to fight the battles of life. And while this doctrine of Curry's, which grew with him finally into a dogma that admitted of no contravention, came at length to find acceptance with legislators, if not with the whole social organism, the co-education theory is yet weighed in the balances of uncertainty and question by the influences that dominate the field of his endeavor.

"Girls ought to have equal advantages with boys for higher education," he shouted to his audience at Blacksburg, in 1882, with a brusqueness and a directness that knew no beating around the bush; and nine years later he preached the same gospel to the legislature of North Carolina.

"Faint murmurs of dissent," he said in Raleigh, in 1891, "are occasionally whispered against the equal education,

but the voice of public justice is beginning to demand that those who are to be wives and mothers shall not be treated with persevering and shameful injustice."

The philosophy of Plato, propounding the majestic question, "Is there anything better in a State than that both women and men be rendered the very best?" and answering it with assured affirmation: "There is not," points no way, of itself, how this one best thing is to be accomplished. But to Curry's earnest thought and single mind the road was straight and narrow, and its sign-post was "Co-education."

"What has been done for higher education of young women in the United States has not accorded with the boasted respect and deference rendered to the sex, nor with what has been so liberally done for young men," he said with a fine scorn, in an address before the Winthrop Training School on May 12, 1889. "Very few institutions for taking young women through advanced courses of study have been endowed and supported by States; but," he adds, and there is a visible note of triumph in the words, "Co-education is fortunately finding increased adoption in colleges and universities."

As Curry's phrase, in his letter to his son, previously quoted in these pages, and prefixed to the volume itself as a sort of text, that men should "live in the present and for the future, leaving the dead past to take care of itself," expressed his most intimate spiritual attitude toward life, so he expressed his most intimate social and political attitude toward education, as an agent for human betterment in the saying:—

The public free schools are the colleges of the people; they are the nurseries of freedom; their establishment and

efficiency are the paramount duty of a republic. The education of children is the most legitimate object of taxation.

His mind dwelt on education in its social and political aspects. He was an educational statesman rather than a scientific expert in pedagogy. His great aim was to fasten the principle of popular education upon the minds of the people, and to interweave it into the structure of the State, leaving to later generations the working out of the principle itself in larger scientific detail. He belongs rather with the Martin Luthers, the Miltons, the Jeffersons, the Matthew Arnolds, and the Horace Manns of the world's educational battle, than with the Sturms, the Pestalozzis, the Rousseaus, the Fröbels, the Herbarts of the unending struggle. His papers and speeches do not compare with Horace Mann's in scientific thoroughness and pedagogic value. They did not need to have these qualities. He stood on Mann's shoulders and faced another sort of social situation; but not Mann himself equalled the intensity, the hard common sense, the unflagging passion with which he lodged his truths in the minds of men. He was not a curriculum maker, but a social propagandist. Yet it is interesting to see how even the details of the great process attracted him; and how his mind played with the psychological side of the problem; and no less interesting to observe how acutely his thought took hold upon the technique of educational processes, and reached out after the truth about the needs of communities in primary, industrial and agricultural instruction. The whole wide field opened itself to him; and he had firm hold of the unity of education, and perceived all of the elements of educational work in one comprehensive

aggregate, conducing to strengthen and advance the life of man.

From the substance of his unnumbered utterances on behalf of what Mr. Winthrop called "The Great Cause," might be constructed and developed, what Curry himself was always too busy to construct and develop, had he cared to do so, a concrete total system of educational plan and scheme, at once as synthetic and as reasonable, though never so original, as Herbert Spencer's elaborate system of philosophy. But such a scheme, so wrought out, would show little that was essentially new. It is in the patience and persistence and power of adaptation with which he applied old theories and practices to new problems, under adventitious circumstances, that his ability as a constructive educator may be said to have lain. Over and over and over again he repeated his propositions, kindled with his hopes and aspirations, and warmed with his eloquence; until the dull ear of his audience awoke to listening, and he entered at last into its brain and heart. The State's duty toward public education; its moral and ethical significance, not only for culture but for the progress demanded by modern life; the material value of education; the relative attitudes of State and Nation, under our political organization, toward public instruction; manual training; industrial training; normal schools and trained teachers; equal opportunity of education for the sexes; co-education in colleges and higher institutions of learning—the absolute necessity for the wise training of a backward race of different ethnic type, set down in our society, in order to protect that society from deterioration and inefficiency,—these were his constant and never-forgotten themes.

He felt kindly toward the negro, but his largest thought was for the integrity of our whole life. It was these theories upon which he addressed hearkening legislatures, and with which he appealed to society. Curry first appeared as a friend of negro education in the summer of 1865, when he presided over a mass-meeting in Marion which made provision for negro schools. There was practically no objection by the whites, even in the lower South, to negro education, until unwise training on the part of unworthy teachers, and a foolish idea of the use to which education was to be put by the negroes themselves, began to alarm the whites. There were true missionaries among the Northern teachers, but there were also rascals who took advantage of the negro, fleeced him of his dollars and led him to think that education meant immediate advancement to Congress or some high public office. Soon the Freedman's Bureau took a hand in the matter, and the great business of education so long directed as an individualistic enterprise by the Southern States became an affair of government, and seemed in the eyes of the blacks and whites to be a sort of "continuation of hostilities against the vanquished." The average New England teacher approached the task, however sincerely, as if the negro was simply a backward white man, an untaught "Mayflower descendant." The aptitudes, capabilities and social needs of the negro were disregarded. The Southern white teacher quickly came to avoid the work as a form of treason, because he thought the prime purpose of the whole educational scheme was to reverse all social and political conditions. True teachers of the negro race, like General Armstrong, and the great

influences that have proceeded from Hampton Institute, like Booker Washington and a small group of thoughtful negro leaders of the past two decades, have found their hardest task in trying to undo what was done in those confused days, partly in passion and sullen pride of power, partly in ignorance, partly in haste by superficial zealots, sometimes, but rarely, let us hope, in ugly hate. Whatever the causes at work, the sad fact remains that the most difficult and delicate social and political problem of modern days was frightfully bungled, and a wedge of iron driven between the whites and blacks, making difficult for generations any sort of sympathetic co-operation in a work of racial adjustment, calling for the clearest and justest human wisdom. The highest claim of J. L. M. Curry to the rank of true statesmanship is that he never lost his head in this tangled matter, nor hardened his heart. There is but one thing to do with a human being in this world and that is to give him wise training for his day and his need. He anchored himself to this principle. He did not lose heart nor grow violent. While he did not hesitate to characterize the reconstruction educational methods "as a scheme to subject the Southern people to negro domination and to secure the States permanently for partisan ends," he saw the sane thing to do, and he pleaded for it from that summer day in the little Alabama town three months after Lee's soldiers had returned to their ploughing until his death in 1903, when common sense had begun to rule negro education, when great schools like Hampton and Tuskegee had arisen as experiment stations to propagate his ideas as well as those of their founders, and when the Southern people, with an unexcelled

political patience, steadiness of purpose and power of will, had removed the negro from the shambles of party strife, had set him in the path he should have been placed in thirty years before, and, in a sense, had settled a question, or a phase of it, at least, more baffling than any presented for solution to the men of our race in our time.

"I shall not stultify myself by any fresh argument in favor of negro education," he declared to a legislative audience—a generation after his first speech for the negroes at Marion—"but I must be pardoned for emphasizing the fact that there is greater need for the education of the other race. The white people are to be the leaders, to take the initiative, to have the directive control in all matters pertaining to civilization and the highest interests of our beloved land. History demonstrates that the Caucasian will rule. He ought to rule. He made our Constitution; he achieved our independence; he is identified with all the true progress, all high civilization, and if true to his mission, while developing his own capabilities, he will lead out all other races as far and as fast as their good and their possibilities will justify. This white supremacy does not mean hostility to the negro, but friendship for him. On the intelligent and more refined class of the white people the negroes have been compelled to rely heretofore for the educational advantages which they possess, and on them in the future they must depend to prevent a widening of the breach between the races and to bring about their higher advancement. It is hopeless to think of the small number of educated negroes protecting themselves against wrongs unless there be men and women cultured, courageous, broad minded to correct, elevate, and lead public opinion. Some wild enthusiasts of the negro race, some purblind fanatics of the white race, may expect or desire subordination or inferiority of the white people, but that is the crazy dream of a kind of racial cosmopolitanism

or fusion which portends loss of national unity and is the forerunner of decay.

“Much has been said—too much cannot be said—of the negro problem. It does not ‘down’ at any man’s bidding. It is a living, ever-present, all-pervasive, apparently irremovable fact. Its solution baffles statesmanship and philanthropy. Education—moral, intellectual, industrial, civic—should be persistently, generously furnished, but, if universal, is slow in its results and while immensely beneficial does not settle irreconcilable racial antagonisms, and it leaves two heterogeneous, unassimilable peoples as coequal citizens with growing cleavage in the same territory. Preachers, sociologists, humanitarians, with their altruistic speculations, may from a safe distance pooh-pooh the problem, but there it is, and there it will remain.

“Recent tragic occurrences at the South are not the gravamen of the problem. They are horrifying, but are incidents. The unmentionable atrocities, filling the timid with direful apprehensions, are committed by a few brutes, who, slaves to appetites, have had their moral perceptions, if discernible at all, blunted by undeveloped intellects, low companionship, descent from depraved mothers, fiery intoxicants, and certainly are far below the average and have not the sympathy and approval of their race. It needs no argument that the more debased, the less self-reliant, the more unskilled, the more thriftless, and unemployed the race or any portion of it is, the more dangerous it will be, the less desirable as inhabitant, as laborer, as citizen, as voter. Plato said a man not sufficiently or properly trained is the most savage animal on earth. Nothing can be more illogical, more indefensible, more unjust, more cruel, more harmful to both races than to hold the negroes responsible for the outrages of a few of their race. Besides, these crimes hardly enter into the problem, which is not one of criminology or vengeance, but exceeding in magnitude and gravity any now existing in a civ-

ilized country, and demanding the patience, wisdom, statesmanship, justice, charity of the best of the land."

The capstone to his whole scheme was his insistence upon the harmonious co-operation of all sorts and grades of schools; and its foundation was his final belief in the paramount importance of the public elementary schools.

"I am a friend of the University, my alma mater," he said to the law-makers of Georgia,—“of colleges, of the theological schools, of high schools; and I would do everything that was reasonable and right for their promotion. But if forced to the alternative of choosing between them and free schools for the masses, the colleges of the people, without the slightest doubt or hesitation I should give my voice and vote for the latter.”

In this statement Curry, like Jefferson, in his famous decision for a newspaper without a government, was startling his audiences into seeing his point. He was too clear visioned not to have sight of the unity of the whole educational process, and to know that the great problem for his successors was to effect the unification of the educational forces of the State.

And so, after all is said, Curry's philosophy of education would seem to hark back at most points to that of Mr. Jefferson, whose views as to the instruction of the citizen by the State have been presented upon an earlier page. But the methods of their propaganda were necessarily different; and the earlier statesman's ideals wear the stamp of a larger originality.

Jefferson, the avatar of republican education in the South, living in an aristocratic age and in the

environment of a society that had its political, its economic and its social basis in the dominance by the few of the many, in his efforts to educate the masses perceived with characteristic intelligence that he must necessarily elevate the citizen from the eminence of the State University. Curry, on the other hand, emerging from the wreck of that earlier society, into an atmosphere where democracy was becoming conscious of itself to the point of triumph, saw, in his turn, that the education of his day and generation must begin with the common school, and touching the people everywhere, lead them from the lower to the higher altitude.

Thus, each of these educational statesmen, conforming himself to the subtle and mysterious influence which moulds and guides the centuries, wrought out his problem after his fashion, with such success as only those encounter who work in consonance with the spirit of the age in which they live.

CHAPTER XXII

CONCLUSION

OUT of the richness and abundance of the materials which he left behind him, it has been sought in this biography to have its subject set forth himself and his career as much as possible in his own language and fashion, and in those of his friends, with such comment only as the narrative has seemed to require, and such interpellation and relation of facts as was necessary to preserve and illustrate the thread of the discourse, and fix the continuity of the story. In this wealth of quotation from diaries and records and letters are very clearly to be discovered by the reader, the character, the capacity, the ambitions, the moral fibre of the man himself, no less than the translated history of his life, his noble career and his lofty achievements. There is little need of any lengthy summing up of a case, whose incidents in consecutive significance have been detailed from the witness-stand during its progress, with such simplicity and exactness as, at once, to establish them in the mind, and to enforce conviction of their truth.

And so, because Curry has thus largely told his own story in this volume, it is not deemed necessary to seek to draw from it, when told, a moral that is obvious, or to endeavor further to adorn a tale that is of itself full of the interest which must inevitably accompany any genuine "human-document."

His life covered a period of time in American history of such vital and violent change, of such spiritual trial and emotional strain as either to confuse hopelessly or to wreck the career of many strong men, but Curry held to a true and steady course.

In this difficult period he served his country and society as statesman, soldier, teacher, preacher, orator, diplomat and educator; and by his example illustrated perfectly the precept of the Apostle, "forgetting those things that are behind, and reaching to those things which are before."

Yet his forgetfulness was never of elementary principles, or of the significance of a tragic past. Regarding the philosophy of life as lying in the right adaptation of self to circumstances, and believing that

"To do
That which before us lies in daily life
Is the prime wisdom,"

he bent all his energies to rehabilitating the wastelands of his country, and to building up a new society on the ruins of that which had been overthrown. He became an American in the broadest and most catholic sense of the term, without ever failing to remember that he was a Southerner and "an ex-Confederate"; and his loyalty to the flag of a reunited country was not tempered nor restrained by his equal loyalty to the old creeds and the old landmarks, established in the faith of the fathers.

In his diary for 1868,—the third year after the close of the War between the States, he wrote this translation from the First Book of Thucydides:—

War, least of all things, proceeds on definite principles,